

Amendments to the Drawings

None

Remarks

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Written Office Action. In particular, the Applicant respectfully thanks the Examiner for the Allowable Subject Matter.

With regard to the substantive portion of the Written Office Action, Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Okita et al.

In response to the Written Office Action, the Applicant respectfully submits the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

In response to rejected Claim 1, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as originally presented, is not anticipated by Okita et al., and is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). “Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires the disclosure in a single piece of prior art of each and every limitation of a claimed invention.” *Apple Computer, Inc. v. Articulate Systems, Inc.* 234 F.3d 14, 20, 57 USPQ2d 1057, 1061 (Fed. Cir. 2000). As originally presented, Independent Claim 1 includes the limitations, “directing a first game object, representing the first musical note in the arrangement, *upward*, in a first substantially straight trajectory, toward a first pad on the virtual drumpad, corresponding to the first musical note, such that the first game object will experience a first collision with the first pad; and directing a second game object, representing the second musical note in the arrangement, *upward*, in a second substantially straight trajectory, toward a second pad on the virtual drumpad, corresponding to the second musical note, such that the second game object will experience a second collision with the second bar or pad, according to the rhythmic pattern of the arrangement.” However, it is believed that Okita et al. does not teach the limitation of an upward trajectory arrangement, Okita et al

discloses “in the notes display, the note bars of rhythm sounds sequentially move *downwards* along with elapsing of time toward the reference line.” [Col. 15 Lines 22-25]

As a result, it is believed that Independent Claim 1, as originally presented, is not anticipated by Okita et al. Therefore, it is believed that Claim 1 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). The Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

In response to objected Claims 2-3, the Applicant believes that Claims 2-3 are dependent upon Allowable Subject Matter. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the objections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

For these reasons, it is believed that none of the prior art teaches the claimed invention. Furthermore, it is believed that the foregoing amendment has adequate support in the specification, and accordingly there should be no new matter. Applicant believes the pending claims have addressed each of the issues pointed out by the Examiner in the Office Action. In light of the foregoing amendment, the claims should be in a condition for allowance. Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the proposed changes, Applicant again invites the Examiner to do so by telephone conference.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Jason P. Webb/

Jason P. Webb
Registration No. 55,714
Attorney for Applicant

Date: June 22, 2009

Advantia Law Group
9035 South 1300 East
Suite 200
Sandy, Utah 84094
Telephone: (801) 272-8368